

### **RECORD OF INTERVIEW**

Applicant, through attorney Jack D. Todd and the undersigned attorney, thank Examiner Venkatanaray Perungavoor for granting a telephone interview on September 29, 2008.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.133(b), the following is submitted as a complete written statement of the issues discussed during the interview. The following statement is intended to comply with the requirements of MPEP § 713.04 and expressly sets forth: (A) a brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted; (B) identification of the claims discussed; (C) identification of specific prior art discussed; (D) identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed; (E) the general thrust of the principal arguments; (F) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed; and (G) the general results or outcome of the interview, if appropriate.

On September 29, 2008, the undersigned and Jack D. Todd contacted the Examiner to discuss the Office Action of August 14, 2008, the scope and intent of the present application, and proposed claim amendments to the pending claims that were deemed by Applicant to overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections contained in the Office Action. (A) No exhibits were shown or discussed; (B) a proposed amended version of claim 223 (which is substantially similar to that presented herein but with additional amendments suggested by the Examiner) was discussed; (C) the *Beck* (U.S. Pat. No. 6,671,273) reference was discussed; (D) proposed amendments in accordance with the amendments presented in this paper, as well as submitted to the Examiner via facsimile on September 26, 2008, were discussed; (E) arguments in accordance with those presented in this paper were discussed; (F) no other pertinent matters were discussed; and (G) during the interview, Applicant stressed that the present claims are directed to granting, denying, or otherwise restricting access to a resource within a computer network based on the authorized user attempting to initiate a communication with the resource; the Examiner indicated that further amendments to the claims to clarify that access to a resource is blocked or granted as a function of embedded unique user

Appln. No. 10/644,632  
Reply to Office Action of August 14, 2008  
Amendment dated November 14, 2008

identifiers in the headers of communication packets may overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections contained in the Office Action.

The amendments and remarks that follow herein are intended to be consistent with the discussion during the interview. In the event that the foregoing record is not considered complete and accurate, the Examiner is respectfully requested to bring any incompleteness or inaccuracy to the attention of the undersigned.